

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/029,464	BEST-DEVEREUX, IGOR	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert D. Rines	3626	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Robert D. Rines. (3) _____

(2) Jens Jenkins (Reg. #44,803).  (4) _____

Date of Interview: 08 February 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1-47.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wolff et al. (2002/0029158).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's above listed representative and Examiner discussed: 1. Amendments to independent claims to more clearly delineate the system structure enabling the reinsurance negotiation process and more clearly distinguish Applicant's claims from the prior art (Wolff et al. 2002/0029158). 2. Applicant's representative also indicated an intention to file an RCE including proposed amendments to independent claims for consideration by the Examiner. 3. Examiner acknowledged that amendments as discussed would require further search and consideration by the Examiner..